



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Daniel Defoe was entered in a list of half-pay officers of 1714 as Capt.-Lieut. has been overlooked. This omission, and others, suggest that the leading authority on Defoe and his times was not consulted in the preparation of this study. Specialists in the field are so few that the investigator who labors in the history of journalism cannot safely ignore any of them.

A few minor slips may be noted. "Dr. Brown" (p. 12) should be Joseph Browne; Browne, not Drake, wrote *A Letter to the Right Honorable* . . . (p. 13); Mr. Ward of Hackney was not Ned or Edward Ward (p. 13); Mrs. Manley's name was Mary (p. 65); Prior's "Whig poem" is mostly prose (p. 68); Leonard Welsted, "government clerk", was a poet, a man of letters in politics (p. 84).

FRANK W. SCOTT.

The Monarchy in Politics. By JAMES ANSON FARRER. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1917. Pp. ix, 342. \$3.00.)

STUDENTS of English constitutional history, and in particular students of the development, from the Revolution of 1688 to the end of the nineteenth century, of government by a cabinet dependent upon a majority in the House of Commons, can freely admit their indebtedness to Mr. Farrer for his study of the monarchy in politics, without feeling called upon to accept or endorse all his conclusions. Mr. Farrer's book is a study of the interference of the crown in politics, chiefly of its interference in political questions—home, colonial, and foreign—which had arrived at a stage at which action had to be taken by the cabinet. There is little discussion of the interference of the crown in parliamentary elections; although a complete end to the activities of the sovereign in that phase of politics is not traceable until Queen Victoria came to the throne in 1837. The reigns included in Mr. Farrer's survey are those of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria.

Mr. Farrer begins abruptly with the opening years of the reign of George III., with no introductory sketch of the development of the cabinet from the reign of Queen Anne to the end of the reign of George II. For students of English history who are familiar with the library of political biography, autobiography, memoirs, recollections, diaries, and letters that has steadily accumulated in the century and a half since 1760, there is not much that can be described as revealing in Mr. Farrer's pages. But even students who are well versed in this literature, and who know where to turn for instances of interference by sovereigns in the plans and policies of cabinets, are much indebted to Mr. Farrer for the industry and skill with which he has worked the vein in biography and letters to which he has turned his attention, and also for the readable form in which he has presented the results of his quarrying.

It is possible to recall only one other book in which this subject is discussed at length. Dunckley, under the *nom de plume* of Verax, wrote

on it in 1878. But Dunckley was concerned only with the instances of Queen Victoria's interference with the cabinet that were revealed in the earlier volumes of Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*. Mr. Farrer's book, as has been indicated, is much more comprehensive; and the material embodied in it is of particular value to those students of the history of cabinet government in England who have not had opportunities for following the relations of the cabinet and the crown, and of the cabinet and Parliament, in what may not inappropriately be called the primary sources.

To discuss Mr. Farrer's conclusions would call for half a dozen pages of the *American Historical Review*. Even in this brief note, however, attention must be directed to one of them.

The course of events [he writes] whilst reducing the appearance of monarchical power, has tended to its increase in reality; for although the actual veto has passed into disuse, the veto precedent has become a more serious barrier against any legislation distasteful to the crown. Mr. Lecky's statement that "the English sovereignty is so restricted in its province that it has, or ought to have, no real influence on legislation" is hardly borne out by the influence exercised over legislation by George III., George IV., William IV., and Queen Victoria.

George III. wrought successfully to make a failure of Pitt's bill of 1785 for the reform of the representative system. George III. and George IV. delayed Catholic emancipation for at least one generation; and enormous pressure was necessary before William IV. would accept Grey's terms in regard to the Reform Act of 1832. But the history of popular political agitations in England from 1832 to the end of the nineteenth century, when compared with the additions to the statute book during those sixty-eight years, would not seem to warrant Mr. Farrer's conclusions in regard to what he describes as the "veto precedent"—the sanction of the crown before the cabinet can introduce an important bill to Parliament. The writer of this note, while thoroughly appreciating the usefulness of Mr. Farrer's contribution to the history of the cabinet, could not subscribe to this sweeping conclusion of the author. It is not possible to accept it in view of the numerous movements for reform from Waterloo to the death of Queen Victoria which were attended with legislative success.

Life of John Wilkes. By HORACE BLEACKLEY. (London and New York: John Lane Company. 1917. Pp. xiii, 464. \$5.00.)

Wilkes and the City. By WILLIAM PURDIE TRELOAR. (London: John Murray. 1917. Pp. xxvi, 299. 12 sh.)

THE career of John Wilkes was not well calculated to win him a place in the *Twelve English Statesmen Series*. At first cautiously tolerated by respectable Whigs, he finally won recognition by the party, only to prove a renegade in the end by going over to the Tories. The Whigs could not laud a man who had deserted them, or the Tories one